

SUBSET SUMS IN $\mathbf{Z}_p$

HOI H. NGUYEN, ENDRE SZEMERÉDI, AND VAN H. VU

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathbf{Z}_p$ be the finite field of prime order p and A be a subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$. We prove several sharp results about the following two basic questions:

- (1) When can one represent zero as a sum of distinct elements of A ?
- (2) When can one represent every element of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ as a sum of distinct elements of A ?

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be an additive group and A be a subset of G . We denote by S_A the collection of subset sums of A :

$$S_A = \left\{ \sum_{x \in B} x \mid B \subset A, |B| < \infty \right\}.$$

The following two questions are among the most popular questions in additive combinatorics

Question 1.1. *When $0 \in S_A$?*

Question 1.2. *When $S_A = G$?*

If S_A does not contain the zero element, we say that A is *zero-sum-free*. If $S_A = G$ ($S_A \neq G$), then we say that A is *complete* (*incomplete*).

In this paper, we focus on the case $G = \mathbf{Z}_p$, the cyclic group of order p , where p is a large prime. The asymptotic notation will be used under the assumption that $p \rightarrow \infty$. For $x \in \mathbf{Z}_p$, $\|x\|$ (the norm of x) is the distance from x to 0. (For example, the norm of $p-1$ is 1.) All logarithms have natural base and $[a, b]$ denotes the set of integers between a and b .

1.3. A sharp bound on the maximum cardinality of a zero-sum-free set.

How big can a zero-sum-free set be ? This question was raised by Erdős and Heilbronn [4] in 1964. In [8], Szemerédi proved that

Theorem 1.4. *There is a positive constant c such that the following holds. If $A \subset \mathbf{Z}_p$ and $|A| \geq cp^{1/2}$, then $0 \in S_A$.*

V. Vu is an A. Sloan Fellow and is supported by an NSF Career Grant.

A result of Olson [6] implies that one can set $c = 2$. More than a quarter of century later, Hamindoune and Zémor [7] showed that one can set $c = \sqrt{2} + o(1)$, which is asymptotically tight.

Theorem 1.5. *If $A \subset \mathbf{Z}_p$ and $|A| \geq (2p)^{1/2} + 5 \log p$, then $0 \in S_A$.*

Our first result removes the logarithmic term in Theorem 1.5, giving the best possible bound (for all sufficiently large p). Let $n(p)$ denote the largest integer such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i < p$.

Theorem 1.6. *There is a constant C such that the following holds for all prime $p \geq C$.*

- If $p \neq \frac{n(p)(n(p)+1)}{2} - 1$, and A is a subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ with $n(p)$ elements, then $0 \in S_A$.
- If $p = \frac{n(p)(n(p)+1)}{2} - 1$, and A is a subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ with $n(p) + 1$ elements, then $0 \in S_A$. Furthermore, up to a dilation, the only 0-sum-free set with $n(p)$ elements is $\{-2, 1, 3, 4, \dots, n(p)\}$.

To see that the bound in the first case is sharp, consider $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n(p) - 1\}$.

1.7. The structure of zero-sum-free sets with cardinality closed to maximum. Theorem 1.6 does not provide information about zero-sum-free sets of size slightly smaller than $n(p)$. The arch typical example for a zero-sum-free set is a set whose sum of elements (as positive integers between 1 and $p - 1$) is less than p . The general phenomenon we would like to support here is that a zero-sum-free set with sufficiently large cardinality should be close to such a set. In [1], Deshouillers [1] showed

Theorem 1.8. *Let A be a zero-sum-free subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of size at least $p^{1/2}$. Then there is some non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that*

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a < p/2} \|a\| \leq p + O(p^{3/4} \log p)$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a > p/2} \|a\| = O(p^{3/4} \log p).$$

The main issue here is the magnitude of the error term. In the same paper, there is a construction of a zero-sum-free set with $cp^{1/2}$ elements ($c > 1$) where

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a < p/2} \|a\| = p + \Omega(p^{1/2})$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a > p/2} \|a\| = \Omega(p^{1/2}).$$

It is conjectured [1] that $p^{1/2}$ is the right order of magnitude of the error term. Here we confirm this conjecture, assuming that $|A|$ is sufficiently close to the upper bound.

Theorem 1.9. *Let A be a zero-sum-free subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of size at least $.99(2p)^{1/2}$. Then there is some non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that*

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a < p/2} \|a\| \leq p + O(p^{1/2})$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in bA, a > p/2} \|a\| = O(p^{1/2}).$$

The constant .99 is adhoc and can be improved. However, we do not elaborate on this point.

1.10. Complete sets. All questions concerning zero-sum-free sets are also natural for incomplete sets. Here is a well-known result of Olson [6]

Theorem 1.11. *Let A be a subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of more than $(4p - 3)^{1/2}$ elements, then A is complete.*

Olson's bound is essentially sharp. To see this, observe that if the sum of the norms of the elements of A is less than p , then A is incomplete. Let $m(p)$ be the largest cardinality of a small set. One can easily verify that $m(p) = 2p^{1/2} + O(1)$. We now want to study the structure of incomplete sets of size close to $2p^{1/2}$. Deshouillers and Freiman [3] proved

Theorem 1.12. *Let A be an incomplete subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of size at least $(2p)^{1/2}$. Then there is some non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that*

$$\sum_{a \in bA} \|a\| \leq p + O(p^{3/4} \log p).$$

Similar to the situation with Theorem 1.8, it is conjectured that the right error term has order $p^{1/2}$ (see [2] for a construction that matches this bound from below). We establish this conjecture for sufficiently large A .

Theorem 1.13. *Let A be an incomplete subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of size at least $1.99p^{1/2}$. Then there is some non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that*

$$\sum_{a \in bA} \|a\| \leq p + O(p^{1/2}).$$

Added in proof. While this paper was written, Deshouillers informed us that he and Prakash have obtained a result similar to Theorem 1.6.

2. MAIN LEMMAS

The main tools in our proofs are the following results from [9].

Theorem 2.1. *Let A be a zero-free-sum subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$. Then we can partition A into two disjoint sets A' and A'' where*

- *A' has negligible cardinality: $|A'| = O(p^{1/2}/\log^2 p)$.*
- *The sum of the elements of (a dilate of) A'' is small: There is a non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that the elements of bA'' belong to the interval $[1, (p-1)/2]$ and their sum is less than p .*

Theorem 2.2. *Let A be an incomplete subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$. Then we can partition A into two disjoint sets A' and A'' where*

- *A' has negligible cardinality: $|A'| = O(p^{1/2}/\log^2 p)$.*
- *The norm sum of the elements of (a dilate of) A'' is small: There is a non-zero element $b \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ such that the sum of the norms of the elements of bA'' is less than p .*

The above two theorems were proved (without being formally stated) in [?]. A stronger version of these theorems will appear in a forth coming paper [5]. We also need the following simple lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $T' \subset T$ be sets of integers with the following property. There are integers $a \leq b$ such that $[a, b] \subset S_{T'}$ and the non-negative (non-positive) elements of $T \setminus T'$ are less than $b - a$ (greater than $a - b$). Then*

$$[a, b + \sum_{x \in T \setminus T', x \geq 0} x] \subset S_T.$$

$$([a + \sum_{x \in T \setminus T', x \leq 0} x, b] \subset S_T.)$$

The (almost trivial) proof is left as an exercise.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $K = \{k_1, \dots, k_l\}$ be a subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$, where the k_i are positive integers and $\sum_{i=1}^l k_i \leq p$. Then $|S_K| \geq l(l+1)/2$.*

To verify this lemma, notice that the numbers

$$k_1, \dots, k_l, k_1+k_l, k_2+k_l, \dots, k_{l-1}+k_l, k_1+k_{l-1}+k_l, \dots, k_{l-2}+k_{l-1}+k_l, \dots, k_1+\dots+k_l$$

are different and all belong to S_K .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Let A be a zero-free-sum subset of $\mathbf{Z}_p$ with size $n(p)$. In fact, as there is no danger for misunderstanding, we will write n instead of $n(p)$. We start with few simple observations.

Consider the partition $A = A' \cup A''$ provided by Theorem 2.1. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the element b equals one. Thus $A'' \subset [1, (p-1)/2]$ and the sum of its elements is less than p . Set $I_n := [1, n]$ be the set of the first n positive integers. We first show that most of the elements of A'' belong to I_n .

Lemma 3.1. $|A'' \cap I_n| \geq n - O(n/\log n)$.

Proof By the definition of n and the property of A''

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i \geq p > \sum_{a \in A''} a.$$

Assume that A'' has l elements in I_n and k elements outside. Then

$$\sum_{a \in A''} a \geq \sum_{i=1}^l i + \sum_{j=1}^k (n+j).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i > \sum_{i=1}^l i + \sum_{j=1}^k (n+j),$$

which, after a routine simplification, yields

$$(l+n+1)(n-l) > (2n+k)k.$$

On the other hand, $n \geq k+l = |A''| \geq n - O(n/\log^2 n)$, thus $n-l = k + O(n/\log^2 n)$ and $n+l+1 \leq 2n-k+1$. So there is a constant c such that

$$(2n-k+1)(k+cn/\log^2 n) > (2n+k)k,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{cn}{k \log^2 n} > \frac{k+1}{2n-k+1}.$$

Since $2n - k + 1 \leq 2n + 1$, a routine consideration shows that $k^2 \log^2 n = O(n^2)$ and thus $k = O(n/\log n)$, completing the proof. $\blacksquare$

The above lemma shows that most of the elements of A'' (and A) belong to I_n . Let $A_1 = A \cap I_n$. It is trivial that

$$|A_1| \geq |A'' \cap I_n| = n - O(n/\log n).$$

Let $A_2 = A \setminus A_1$. We have

$$t := |I_n \setminus A_1| = |A_2| = |A| - |A_1| = O(n/\log n).$$

Next we show that S_{A_1} contains a very long interval. Set $I := [2t+3, (n+1)(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t - 1)]$. The length of I is $(1 - o(1))p$; thus I almost cover $\mathbf{Z}_p$.

Lemma 3.2. $I \subset S_{A_1}$.

Proof We need to show that every element x of in this interval can be written as a sum of distinct elements of A_1 . There are two cases:

Case 1. $2t+3 \leq x \leq n$. In this case A_1 contains at least $x - 1 - t \geq (x+1)/2$ elements in the interval $[1, x-1]$. This guarantees that there are two distinct elements of A_1 adding up to x .

Case 2. $x = k(n+1) + r$ for some $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t - 2$ and $0 \leq r \leq n+1$. First, notice that since $|A_1|$ is very close to n (in fact it is enough to have $|A_1|$ slightly larger than $2n/3$ here), one can find three distinct elements $a, b, c \in A_1$ such that $a + b + c = n + 1 + r$. Consider the set $A'_1 = A_1 \setminus \{a, b, c\}$. We will represent $x - (n+1+r) = (k-1)(n+1)$ as a sum of distinct elements of A'_1 . Notice that there are exactly $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ ways to write $n+1$ as a sum of two different positive integers. We discard a pair if (at least) one of its two elements is not in A'_1 . Since $|A'_1| = n - t - 3$, we discard at most $t+3$ pairs. So there are at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t - 3$ different pairs (a_i, b_i) where $a_i, b_i \in A'_1$ and $a_i + b_i = (n+1)$. Thus, $(k-1)(n+1)$ can be written as a sum of distinct pairs. Finally, x can be written as a sum of a, b, c with these pairs. $\blacksquare$

Now we investigate the set $A_2 = A \setminus A_1$. This is the collection of elements of A outside the interval I_n . Since A is zero sum free, $0 \notin A_2 + I$ thanks to Lemma 3.2. It follows that

$$A_2 \subset \mathbf{Z}_p \setminus \{I_n \cup (-I) \cup \{0\}\} \subset J_1 \cup J_2,$$

where $J_1 := [-2t-2, -1]$ and $J_2 = [(n+1), p - (n+1)(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t - t)] = [(n+1), q]$. We set $B := A_2 \cap J_1$ and $C := A_2 \cap J_2$.

Lemma 3.3. $S_B \subset J_1$.

Proof Assume otherwise. Then there is a subset B' of B such that $\sum_{a \in B'} a \leq -2t-3$ (here the elements of B are viewed as negative integers between -1 and $-2t-3$). Among such B' , take one where $\sum_{a \in B'} a$ has the smallest absolute value. For this B' , $\sum_{a \in B'} a \leq -4t-4$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2, the interval $2t+3, 4t+4$ belongs to S_{A_1} . This implies that $0 \in S_{A_1} + S_b \subset S_A$, a contradiction. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 3.3 implies that $\sum_{a \in B} |a| \leq 2t+2$, which yields

$$|B| \leq 2(t+1)^{1/2}. \quad (1)$$

Set $s := |C|$. We have $s \geq t - 2(t+1)^{1/2}$. Let $c_1 < \dots < c_s$ be the elements of C and $h_1 < \dots < h_t$ be the elements of $I_n \setminus A_1$.

By the definition of n , $\sum_{i=1}^n i > p > \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i$. Thus, there is an (unique) $h \in I_n$ such that

$$p = 1 + \dots + (h-1) + (h+1) + \dots + n. \quad (2)$$

A quantity which plays an important role in what follows is

$$D := \sum_{i=1}^s c_i - \sum_{j=1}^t h_j.$$

Notice that if we replace the h_j by the c_i in (2), we represent $p + D$ as a sum of distinct elements of A

$$p + D = \sum_{a \in X, X \subset A} a. \quad (3)$$

The leading idea now is to try to cancel D by throwing a few elements from the right hand side or adding a few negative elements (of A) or both. If this was always possible, then we would have a representation of p as a sum of distinct

elements in A (in other words $0 \in S_A$), a contradiction. To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.6, we are going to show that the only case when it is not possible is when $p = n(n+1)/2 - 1$ and $A = \{-2, 1, 3, 4, \dots, n\}$. We consider two cases:

Case 1. $h \in A_1$. Set $A'_1 = A_1 \setminus \{h\}$ and apply Lemma 3.2 to A'_1 , we conclude that $S_{A'_1}$ contains the interval $I' = [2(t+1) + 3, (n+1)(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t - 2)]$.

Lemma 3.4. $D < 2(t+1) + 3$.

Proof Assume $D \geq 2(t+1) + 3$. Notice that the largest element in J_2 (and thus in C) is less than the length of I' . So by removing the c_i one by one from D , one can obtain a sum $D' = \sum_{i=1}^{s'} c_i - \sum_{j=1}^t h_j$ which belongs to I' , for some $s' \leq s$. This implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s'} c_i = \sum_{j=1}^t h_j + \sum_{a \in X} a$$

for some subset X of A'_1 . Since $h \notin A'_1$, the right hand side is a sub sum of the right hand side of (2). Let Y be the collection of the missing elements (from the right hand side of (2)). Then $Y \subset A_1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s'} c_i + \sum_{a \in Y} a = p$. On the other hand, the left hand side belongs to $S_{A_1} + S_{A_2} \subset S_A$. It follows that $0 \in S_A$, a contradiction. $\blacksquare$

Now we take a close look at the inequality $D < 2(t+1) + 3$. First, observe that since A is zero-sum-free, $-S_B \subset \{h_1, \dots, h_t\}$. By Lemma 3.3, $\sum_{a \in B} |a| \leq 2t + 2 < p$. As B has $t - s$ elements, by Lemma 2.4, S_B has at least $(t-s)(t-s+1)/2$ elements. It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t h_i \leq (2t+2) + \sum_{j=0}^{(t-(t-s)(t-s+1)/2)+1} (n-j).$$

On the other hand, as all elements of C are larger than n

$$\sum_{i=1}^s c_s \geq \sum_{i=1}^s (n+i).$$

It follows that D is at least

$$\sum_{i=1}^s (n+i) - (2t+2) - \sum_{j=0}^{(t-(t-s)(t-s+1)/2)+1} (n-j).$$

If $t - s \geq 2$, then $s > t - (t - s)(t - s + 1)/2$, so the last formula has order $\Omega(n) \gg t$, thus $D \gg 2(t + 1) + 3$, a contradiction. Therefore, $t - s$ is either 0 or 1.

If $t - s = 0$, then $D = \sum_{i=1}^t c_i - \sum_{i=1}^t h_i \geq t^2$. This is larger than $2t + 5$ if $t \geq 4$. Thus, we have $t = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

- $t = 0$. In this case $A = I_n$ and $0 \in S_A$.
- $t = 1$. In this case $A = I_n \setminus \{h_1\} \cup c_1$. If $c_1 - h_1 \neq h$, then we could substitute c_1 for $h_1 + (c_1 - h_1)$ in (2) and have $0 \in S_A$. This means that $h = c_1 - h_1$. Furthermore, $h < 2t + 5 = 7$ so both c_1 and h_1 are close to n . If $h \geq 3$,

$$p = \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} i + \sum_{j=h+1}^n j = \sum_{i=2}^{h-2} i + \sum_{h+1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq h_1} j + c_1.$$

Similarly, if $h = 1$ or 2 then we have

$$p = \sum_{i=1}^h i + \sum_{h+2 \leq j \leq n, j \neq h_1} j + c_1.$$

- $t > 1$. Since $D < 2t + 5$, $h_1, \dots, h_t$ are all larger than $n - 2t - 4$. As p is sufficiently large, we can assume $n \geq 4t + 10$, which implies that $[1, 2t + 5] \subset A_1$. If $h \neq 1$, then it is easy to see that $[3, 2t + 5] \subset S_{A_1 \setminus \{h\}}$. As $t > 1$, $D \geq t^2 \geq 4$ and can be represented as a sum of elements in $A_1 \setminus \{h\}$. Omitting these elements from (3), we obtain a representation of p as a sum of elements of A . The only case left is $h = 1$ and $D = 4$. But D can equal 4 if and only if $t = 2$, $c_1 = n + 1$, $c_2 = n + 2$, $h_1 = n - 1$, $h_2 = n$. In this case, we have

$$p = \sum_{i=2}^n i = 2 + 3 + \sum_{i=5}^{n+2} i.$$

Now we turn to the case $t - s = 1$. In this case B has exactly one element in the interval $[-2t - 2, -1]$ (modulo p) and D is at least $s^2 - (2t + 2) = (t - 1)^2 - (2t + 2)$. Since $D < 2t + 5$, we conclude that t is at most 6. Let $-b$ be the element in B (where b is a positive integer). We have $b \leq 2t + 2 \leq 14$. A_1 misses exactly t elements from I_n ; one of them is b and all other are close to n (at least $n - (2t + 4)$). Using this information, we can reduce the bound on b further. Notice that the whole interval $[1, b - 1]$ belongs to A_1 . So if $b \geq 3$, then there are two elements x, y of A_1 such that $x + y = b$. Then $x + y + (-b) = 0$, meaning $0 \in S_A$. It thus remain to consider $b = 1$ or 2 . Now we consider a few cases depending on the value of D . Notice that $D \geq s^2 - b \geq -2$. In fact, if $s \geq 2$ then $D \geq 2$. Furthermore, if $s = 0$, then $t = 1$ and $D = -h_1 = -b$.

- $D \geq 5$. Since A_1 misses at most one element in $[1, D]$ (the possible missing element is b), there are two elements of A_1 adding up to D . Omitting these elements from (3), we obtain a representation of p as a sum of distinct elements of A .

- $D = 4$. If $b = 1$, write $p = \sum_{a \in X, a \neq 2} a + (-b)$. If $b = 2$, then $p = \sum_{a \in X, a \neq 1, 3} a$. (Here and later X is the set in (3).)
- $D = 3$. Write $p = \sum_{a \in X, a \neq 3-b} a + (-b)$.
- $D = 2$. If $b = 1$, then $p = \sum_{a \in X, a \neq 2} a$. If $b = 2$, then $p = \sum_{a \in X} a + (-2)$.
- $D = 1$. If $b = 1$, then $p = \sum_{a \in X} a + (-1)$. If $b = 2$, then $p = \sum_{a \in X, a \neq 1} a$.
- $D = 0$. In this case (3) already provides a representation of p .
- $D = -1$. In this case $s < 2$. But since $h \neq b$, s cannot be 0. If $s = 1$ then $b = 2$ and $c_1 = n + 1$, $h_1 = n$. By (2), we have $p = \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} i + \sum_{j=h+1}^n j$ and so

$$p + (h - 1) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, i \notin \{2, n\}} i$$

where the right hand side consists of elements of A only. If $h - 1 \in A$ then we simply omit it from the sum. If $h - 1 \notin A$, then $h - 1 = 2$ and $h = 3$. In this case, we can write

$$p = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, i \notin \{2, n\}} i + (-2).$$

- $D = -2$. This could only occur if $s = 0$ and $b = 2$. In this case $A = \{-2, 1, 3, \dots, n\}$. If $h = 1$, then $p = \sum_{i=2}^n i = n(n+1)/2 - 1$ and we end up with the only exceptional set. If $h \geq 3$, then $p + (h - 2) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq 2} i$. If $h \neq 4$, then we can omit $h - 2$ from the right hand side to obtain a representation of p . If $h = 4$, then we can write

$$p = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq 2} i + (-2).$$

Case 2. $h \notin A$. In this case we can consider A_1 instead of A'_1 . The consideration is similar and actually simpler. Since $h \notin A$, we only need to consider $D := \sum_{i=1}^s c_i - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t, h_j \neq h} h_j$. Furthermore, as $h \notin A$, if $s = 0$ we should have $h = b$ and this forbid us to have any exceptional structure in the case $D = -2$. The detail is left as an exercise.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

We follow the same terminology used in the previous section. Assume that A is zero-sum-free and $|A| = \lambda n = \lambda(2p)^{1/2}$ with some $1 \geq \lambda \geq .99$. Furthermore, assume that the element b in Theorem 2.1 is one. We will use the notation of the previous proof. Let the *core* of A be the collection of all pairs $(a, a') \in A \times A$, $a \neq a'$ and $a + a' = n + 1$. Theorem 1.9 follows directly from the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *The core of A has size at least $.6n$.*

Lemma 4.2. *Let A be a zero-sum-free set whose core has size at least $(1/2 + \epsilon)n$ (for some positive constant ϵ). Then*

$$\sum_{a \in A, a < p/2} a \leq p + \frac{1}{\epsilon}(n+1)$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in A, a > p/2} \|a\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + 1\right)n.$$

Proof (Proof of Lemma 4.1.) Following the proof of Lemma 3.1, with $l = |A'' \cap I_n|$ and $k = |A'' \setminus I_n|$, we have

$$(l + n + 1)(n - l) > (2n + k)k.$$

On the other hand, $n \geq k + l = |A''| = |A| - O(n/\log^2 n)$, thus $n - l = k + n - |A| + O(n/\log^2 n) = (1 - \lambda + o(1))n + k$ and $n + l \leq (1 + \lambda)n - k$. Putting all these together with the fact that λ is quite close to 1, we can conclude that that $k < .1n$. It follows (rather generously) that $l = \lambda n - k - O(n/\log^2 n) > .8n$.

The above shows that most of the elements of A belong to I_n , as

$$|A_1| = |A \cap I_n| \geq |A'' \cap I_n| > .8n.$$

Split A_1 into two sets, A'_1 and $A''_1 := A_1 \setminus A'_1$, where A'_1 contains all elements a of A_1 such that $n+1-a$ also belongs to A_1 . Recall that A_1 has at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t$ pairs (a_i, b_i) satisfying $a_i + b_i = n+1$. This guarantees that $|A'_1| \geq 2(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - t) \geq .6n$. On the other hand, A'_1 is a subset of the core of A . The proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

Proof (Proof of Lemma 4.2) Abusing the notation slightly, we use A'_1 to denote the core of A . We have $|A'_1| \geq (1/2 + \epsilon)n$.

Lemma 4.3. *Any $l \in [n(1/\epsilon + 1), n(1/\epsilon + 1) + n]$ can be written as a sum of $2(1/\epsilon + 1)$ distinct elements of A'_1 .*

Proof First notice that for any m belongs to $I_\epsilon = [(1-\epsilon)n, (1+\epsilon)n]$, the number of pairs $(a, b) \in A'^2_1$ satisfying $a < b$ and $a+b = m$ is at least $\epsilon n/2$. Next, observe that any k , $k \in [0, n]$, is a sum of $1/\epsilon + 1$ integers (not necessarily distinct) from $[0, \epsilon n]$. Consider l from $[n(1/\epsilon + 1), n(1/\epsilon + 1) + n]$; we can represent $l - n(1/\epsilon + 1)$ as a sum $a_1 + \dots + a_{1/\epsilon+1}$ where $0 \leq a_1, \dots, a_{1/\epsilon+1} \leq \epsilon n$. Thus l can be written as a sum of $1/\epsilon + 1$ elements (not necessarily distinct) of I_ϵ , as $l = (n + a_1) + \dots + (n + a_{1/\epsilon+1})$. Now we represent each summand in the above representation of l by two elements of A'_1 . By the first observation, the numbers of pairs are much larger than the number of summands, we can manage so that all elements of pairs are different. $\blacksquare$

Recall that A'_1 consists of pairs (a'_i, b'_i) where $a'_i + b'_i = n + 1$, so

$$\sum_{a' \in A'_1} a' = (n + 1)|A'_1|/2.$$

Lemma 4.4. $I' := [n(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a' \in A'_1} a' - (n + 1)/\epsilon] \subset S_{A'_1}$.

Proof Lemma 4.3 implies that for each $x \in [n(1/\epsilon + 1), n(1/\epsilon + 1) + n]$ there exist distinct elements $a'_1, \dots, a'_{2(1/\epsilon + 1)} \in A'_1$ such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^{2(1/\epsilon + 1)} a'_i$. We discard all a'_i and $(n + 1) - a'_i$ from A'_1 . Thus there remain exactly $|A'_1|/2 - 2(1/\epsilon + 1)$ different pairs (a''_i, b''_i) where $a''_i + b''_i = n + 1$. The sums of these pairs represent all numbers of the form $k(n + 1)$ for any $0 \leq k \leq |A'_1|/2 - 2(1/\epsilon + 1)$. We thus obtained a representation of $x + k(n + 1)$ as a sum of different elements of A'_1 , in other word $x + k(n + 1) \in S_{A'_1}$. As x varies in $[n(1/\epsilon + 1), n(1/\epsilon + 1) + n]$ and k varies in $[0, |A'_1|/2 - 2(1/\epsilon + 1)]$, the proof is completed. $\blacksquare$

Let $A_2 = A \setminus A_1$ and set $A'_2 := A_2 \cap [0, (p - 1)/2]$ and $A''_2 = A_2 \setminus A'_2$. We are going to view A''_2 as a subset of $[-(p - 1)/2, -1]$.

We will now invoke Lemma 2.3 several times to conclude Lemma 4.2. First, it is trivial that the length of I' is much larger than n , whilst elements of A_1 are positive integers bounded by n . Thus, Lemma 2.3 implies that

$$I'' := [n(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a \in A_1} a - (n + 1)/\epsilon] \subset S_{A_1}.$$

Note that the length of I'' is greater than $(p - 1)/2$. Indeed $n \approx (2p)^{1/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |I''| &= \sum_{a \in A_1} a - (n + 1)/\epsilon - n(1/\epsilon + 1) \geq \sum_{a \in A'_1} a - O(n) \\ &\geq (1/2 + \epsilon)n(n + 1)/2 - O(n) > (p - 1)/2. \end{aligned}$$

Again, Lemma 2.3 (applied to I'') yields that

$$[n(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a \in A_1 \cup A'_2} a - (n + 1)/\epsilon] \subset S_{A_1 \cup A'_2}$$

and

$$[\sum_{a \in A''_2} a + n(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a \in A_1} a - (n + 1)/\epsilon] \subset S_{A_1 \cup A''_2}.$$

The union of these two long intervals belongs to S_A

$$\left[\sum_{a \in A_2''} a + n(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a \in A_1 \cup A_2'} a - (n+1)/\epsilon \right] \subset S_A.$$

On the other hand, $0 \notin S_A$ implies

$$\sum_{a \in A_2''} a + n(1/\epsilon + 1) > 0$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in A_1 \cup A_2'} a - (n+1)/\epsilon < p.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 is completed. ■

5. SKETCH OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.13

Assume that A is incomplete and $|A| = \lambda p^{1/2}$ with some $2 \geq \lambda \geq 1.99$. Furthermore, assume that the element b in Theorem 2.2 is one. We are going to view $\mathbf{Z}_p$ as $[-(p-1)/2, (p-1)/2]$.

To make the proof simple, we made some new invention: $n = \lfloor p^{1/2} \rfloor$, $A_1 := A \cap [-n, n]$, $A_1' := A \cap [0, n]$, $A_1'' := A \cap [-n, -1]$, $A_2' := A \cap [n+1, (p-1)/2]$, $A_2'' := A \cap [-(p-1)/2, -(n+1)]$, $t_1' := |A_1'|$, $t_1'' := |A_1''|$, $t_1 := |A_1| = t_1' + t_1''$.

Notice that $|A''|$ (in Theorem 2.2) is sufficiently close to the upper bound. The following holds.

Lemma 5.1. *Most of the elements of $A''(A)$ belong to $[-n, n]$;*

- both t_1' and t_1'' are larger than $(1/2 + \epsilon)n$,
- t_1 is larger than $(2^{1/2} + \epsilon)n$

with some positive constant ϵ .

As a consequent, both $S_{A \cap [-n, -1]}$ and $S_{A \cap [1, n]}$ contain long intervals thanks to the following Lemma, which is a direct application of Lemma 4.3 and argument provided in Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 5.2. *If X is a subset of $[1, n]$ with size at least $(1/2 + \epsilon)n$. Then*

$$[(n+1)(1/\epsilon + 1), (n+1)(n/2 - t - c_\epsilon)] \subset S_X$$

where $t = n - |X|$ and c_ϵ depends only on ϵ .

Now we can invoke Lemma 2.3 several times to conclude Theorem 1.13.

Lemma 5.2 implies

$$I' := [(n+1)(1/\epsilon+1), (n+1)(n/2 - t'_1 - c_\epsilon)] \subset S_{A'_1}.$$

and

$$I'' := [-(n+1)(n/2 - t''_1 - c_\epsilon), -(n+1)(1/\epsilon+1)] \subset S_{A''_1}.$$

Lemma 2.3 (applied to I' and A''_1 ; I'' and A'_1 respectively) yields

$$[\sum_{a''_1 \in A''_1} a''_1 + (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1), (n+1)(n/2 - t'_1 - c_\epsilon)] \subset S_{A_1}$$

and

$$[-(n+1)(n/2 - t''_1 - c_\epsilon), \sum_{a'_1 \in A'_1} a'_1 - (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1)] \subset S_{A_1}.$$

which gives

$$I := [\sum_{a''_1 \in A''_1} a''_1 + (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1), \sum_{a'_1 \in A'_1} a'_1 - (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1)] \subset S_{A_1}.$$

Note that the length of I is greater than $(p-1)/2$. Again, Lemma 2.3 (applied to I and A'_2 , I and A''_2 respectively) implies

$$[\sum_{a'' \in A''_1 \cup A''_2} a'' + (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1), \sum_{a'_1 \in A'_1} a'_1 - (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1)] \subset S_A$$

and

$$[\sum_{a''_1 \in A''_1} a''_1 + (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1), \sum_{a' \in A'_1 \cup A'_2} a' - (n+1)(1/\epsilon+1)] \subset S_A.$$

The union of these two intervals belongs to S_A ,

$$\left[\sum_{a'' \in A_1'' \cup A_2''} a'' + (n+1)(1/\epsilon + 1), \sum_{a' \in A_1' \cup A_2'} a' - (n+1)(1/\epsilon + 1) \right] \subset S_A.$$

On the other hand, $S_A \neq \mathbf{Z}_p$ implies

$$\sum_{a' \in A_1' \cup A_2'} a' - \sum_{a'' \in A_1'' \cup A_2''} a'' - 2(n+1)(1/\epsilon + 1) < p.$$

In other word

$$\sum_{a \in A} \|a\| \leq p + O(p^{1/2}).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Jean-Marc Deshouillers, *Quand seule la sous-somme vide est nulle modulo p*, the prodeeding of the Journees Arithmetiques 2005.
- [2] Jean-Marc Deshouillers, *Lower bound concerning subset sum wich do not cover all the residues modulo p*, Hardy- Ramanujan Journal, Vol. 28(2005) 30-34.
- [3] Jean-Marc Deshouillers and Gregory A. Freiman, *When subset-sums do not cover all the residues modulo p*, Journal of Number Theory 104(2004) 255-262.
- [4] Paul Erdős and Heilbronn Hans Arnold, *On the addition of residue classes modulo p*, Acta Arith. 9 (1964) 149–159.
- [5] Hoi H. Nguyen, E. Szemerédi and Van H. Vu, Classification theorems for sumsets, in preparation.
- [6] J. E. Olson, *An addition theorem modulo p*, J. Combinatorial Theory 5(1968), 45-52.
- [7] Hamidoune Yahya Ould and Zémor Gilles, *On zero-free subset sums*, Acta Arith. 78 (1996) no. 2, 143–152.
- [8] Endre Szemerédi, *On a conjecture of Erdős and Heilbronn*, Acta Arith. 17 (1970) 227-229.
- [9] Endre Szemerédi and Van H. Vu, *Long arithmetic progression in sumsets and the number of x-free sets*. Proceeding of London Math Society, 90(2005) 273-296.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, RUTGERS, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854

E-mail address: `vanvu@math.rutgers.edu`